



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/648,009	08/25/2003	Amlan Datta	129843.1104	3329
60148 7590 12/27/2006 GARDERE / JAMES HARDIE GARDERE WYNNE SEWELL, LLP 1601 ELM STREET SUITE 3000 DALLAS, TX 75201			EXAMINER MARCANTONI, PAUL D	
			ART UNIT 1755	PAPER NUMBER
SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD OF RESPONSE		MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE	
3 MONTHS		12/27/2006	PAPER	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire 6 MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/648,009	DATTA ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Paul Marcantoni	1755	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 20 November 2006.
- 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-3 and 5-15 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 2,3 and 7-11 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1,5,6 and 12-15 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) 1-3 and 5-15 are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 - a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____
3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____	5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application
	6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____

Art Unit: 1755

Election Without Traverse-Incomplete Response:

Applicant's election of Group I, claims 1,5,6, and 12-15 in the reply filed on 11/20/06 is acknowledged. Because applicant did not distinctly and specifically point out the supposed errors in the restriction requirement, the election has been treated as an election without traverse (MPEP § 818.03(a)).

Provisional ODP

Claims 1, 5, 6, and 12-15 are provisionally rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-27 and 1-15 of copending Application Nos. 2004/0081827 A1 (Datta et al.) and 2004/0079260 A1 (Datta et al.). Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because both teach a composition comprising microspheres that would appear to be the same as claimed by applicants. Overlapping ranges of amounts would have been prima facie obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art. Further, the applicants' intended use of a known composition in their claims 12-15 is not a patentable distinction. The new use of a known composition is not patentable.

This is a provisional obviousness-type double patenting rejection because the conflicting claims have not in fact been patented.

ODP

Claims 1,5,6, and 12-15 are rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-45 of U.S. Patent No. 6,572,697 (Gleeson et al.). Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because both teach a composition comprising

Art Unit: 1755

microspheres that would appear to be the same. Further, applicants' use of comprising claim language in claim 1 permits the inclusion of other ingredients such as cement even in major amounts. Comprising leaves the claim open for the inclusion of unspecified ingredients even in major amounts. Ex parte Davis et al., 80 USPQ 448 (PTO Bd of App.1948). Further, the applicants' intended use of a known composition in their claims 12-15 is not a patentable distinction. The new use of a known composition is not patentable.

The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. A nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting rejection is appropriate where the conflicting claims are not identical, but at least one examined application claim is not patentably distinct from the reference claim(s) because the examined application claim is either anticipated by, or would have been obvious over, the reference claim(s). See, e.g., *In re Berg*, 140 F.3d 1428, 46 USPQ2d 1226 (Fed. Cir. 1998); *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) or 1.321(d) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent either is shown to be commonly owned with this application, or claims an invention made as a result of activities undertaken within the scope of a joint research agreement.

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1,5, 6, and 12-15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as anticipated by or, in the alternative, under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as obvious over Beck et al. (3M Patent-US Patent Number 3,365,315-also found on page 11 paragraph [0038] of applicants' specification) or Goetz et al. (US Patent Number 4,983,550).

Beck et al. teach a glass bubble (equivalent to a microsphere) comprising the same components as claimed by applicants in overlapping amounts thus anticipating applicants' claims (see claims and Table I in col.4, lines 25-45). Beck also teaches the same particle size of between 5 and 300 microns in claim 1 in column 8 thus anticipating applicants' claims. Even if not anticipated, overlapping ranges of amounts would have been *prima facie* obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art.

Goetz et al. teach in claim 1 in column 7 hollow glass spheres comprising the same components claimed by applicants in overlapping amounts thus anticipating applicants' claims. Goetz et al. also teach a particle size overlapping applicants' claims

(see col.5, lines 1-20). Even if not anticipated, overlapping ranges of amounts would have been *prima facie* obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art.

Further, the applicants' intended use of a known composition in their claims 12-15 is not a patentable distinction. The new use of a known composition is not patentable.

Cited of Interest:

Fehlmann '962 and Torobin '732 have been cited of interest as relevant art that could have also potentially been applied against applicants' claims. Applicants may wish to briefly comment on these if they hold they do not teach their claimed invention.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Paul Marcantoni whose telephone number is 571-272-1373. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).



Paul Marcantoni
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 1755